



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,551	11/07/2003	Hong Su Lee	2658-0314P	8245

2292 7590 11/22/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

VARGOT, MATHIEU D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/702,551

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Mathieu D. Vargot

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 7-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 7-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1732

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art as shown in instant Figures 1-3 and disclosed in paragraphs 3-8 of the instant specification in view of Johnson (see 19 and 20 in the figure).

As admitted by applicant in the instant specification—see paragraphs 3-8 which refer to instant Figures 1-3—the instant claims are taught in the admitted prior art, lacking essentially the aspect of a fastening member for the stamper extending through the core and into the stamper and the particular thickness for the stamper. Again, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have made the stamper whatever thickness deemed desirable dependent on strength and heat transfer characteristics required. Hence, while the admitted prior art makes the stampers .1-.4 mm thick, it certainly would not be an invention to have utilized stampers 6-12 mm thick should one desire to make them this thick. Ie, simply because the admitted prior art had a problem with plating the nickel does not render increasing the stamper thickness of the prior art to the instant levels as non-obvious. In fact, this disclosure—ie, recognition of the problems of the prior art as pointed out by applicant-- may have indeed prompted one of ordinary skill in the art to explore different methods of making the stamper. At any rate, the instant stamper thickness constitutes a result effective variable which one of ordinary

Art Unit: 1732

skill in the art would have found obvious to vary dependent on strength and heat transfer characteristics desired. Concerning the former, Johnson teaches a fastening member (ie, bolt 19/20 and the associated nut) that attaches a die portion (12/13) to mold a lens to a platen member (16), the bolt passing through the platen and into the die portion and the nut securing the bolt to the platen being accessible from outside the platen. Clearly, the instant fastening arrangement, or one equivalent to the instant, is shown in Johnson. A bolt fastener extends through a platen (or core) to which a die portion (or stamper) is attached. It is respectfully submitted that the instant fastening arrangement is simply too well known in the art to make the instant claims patentable, as such would clearly be a convenient way to attach the stamper. The newly added claims are taught in the admitted prior art. Clearly, if the light guide plate produced by the mold of the prior art has the instant prism unevenness, then the mold that produced it must also have this.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Upon updating the search, the reference to Johnson was uncovered and this reference is submitted to teach what was found lacking in the previous rejection concerning the fastening arrangement. The aspect of the stamper thickness has been essentially addressed supra in the rejection. Lacking some unexpected result, exact thicknesses and materials used for known mold structures are simply not patentable features. It is further noted that the limitations of newly added claims 20-29 are all taught in the admitted prior art. Applicant is referred to paragraphs 3-8 of the instant specification.


Art Unit: 1732

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
November 20, 2005


Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

11/20/06